UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,118	10/04/2000	Jon B. Avner	13768.173	7799

47973   7590   03/25/2005

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
GYORFI, THOMAS A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 December 2004</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is

closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25 and 27-29</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25 and 27-29</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-25 and 27-29 remain for examination. The correspondence filed

12/3/04 amended claims 1, 17, 19, and 25, and added claims 27-29.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments, filed 12/03/04, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s)

1-25 under 35 USC 102(b) in view of Bernstein have been fully considered and are

persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further

consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Bernstein and Kikinis

under 35 USC 103(a).

3.   Applicant argues, "*In no event does Bernstein discuss or suggest that the LMS system*

performs high-level document commands to the data or documents that are accessed from the various

client applications, as claimed in the present invention." Examiner disagrees with this contention.

As one example, the LMS system is capable of processing commands issued via a

mouse on the data or documents that are accessed from the various client applications

(col. 16, lines 53-56), which include such high-level operations as creating a link in a

document (col. 17, lines 40-55).

4.   Applicant states, "*In fact, with regard to the Examiner's support for many of his rejections,*

Applicants are somewhat confused as to why the Examiner cited the passages he did because the cited

passages do not appear to support or clarify the Examiner's rejections. See, for example, the rejections to

claim 2 (regarding grouping commands), claims 3-4 (regarding atomic execution, claims 7 and 8

(regarding email), claims 9-10 and 13 (regarding moving, deleting and adding a document, claim 14

(regarding the system configuration), etc." Further clarification is provided below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bernstein et al. (U.S. Patent 5,297,249) and further in view of Kikinis (PCT

Application WO 98/03928).

Referring to Claims 1 and 19:

Bernstein discloses in a database management system that includes a database

engine that receives and implements high-level document commands, each high-level

document command comprising one or more operations to be performed on a

document (col. 11, lines 15-30), a method for allowing client applications to control how

a particular high-level document command is implemented, the method comprising the

following:

an act of receiving a high-level document command meeting certain criteria (col.

15, lines 30-50);

prior to implementing the high-level document command, an act of identifying

one or more client applications that are to be notified of the receipt of the-only high-level

document commands meeting certain criteria (col. 11, lines 20-40);

prior to implementing the single high-level document command, an act of

notifying the one or more identified client applications that the single high-level

document command meeting the certain criteria has been received, notification of the

one or more client applications being triggered solely as a result of receiving the single

high-level document command (col. 15, lines 15-30);

an act of receiving modifying instructions from the one or more client applications

on how to effect the implementation of the single high-level document command (col.

15, lines 25-45); and

an act of altering the one or more operations included in the single high-level

document command according to the modifying instruction (col. 15, lines 35-47).

Bernstein does not explicitly disclose wherein the document to be operated upon

comprises one of an email document and a folder having an email document. However,

Kikinis discloses that email documents and folders containing email documents can be

operated upon via a hypermedia system (Kikinis, page 2, lines 17-27). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

modify Bernstein to perform operations on email documents and folders containing

email documents. The motivation for doing so would be to provide a standard

mechanism to access email that supports multiple clients (page 1, lines 17-31).

Referring to Claim 17:

Bernstein discloses a database management system that includes a database

engine that accesses and updates objects in a database, the database engine receiving

high-level document commands, each high-level document command for performing an

operation on a document that is associated with a plurality of tables in the database

(col. 8, lines 55-65), a method for allowing client applications to control how a particular

high-level document command is implemented in the database, the method comprising

the following:

an act of receiving a high-level document command meeting certain criteria (col.

1, lines 35-40; col. 3, lines 5-20).

a step for allowing one or more client applications to affect how the received

high-level document command is to be implemented, if at all, in the database (col. 15,

lines 40-50),

the step for allowing one or more client applications to affect how the received

high level document command is to be implemented, including an act of identifying one

or more client applications that are to be notified of the receipt of only high-level

document commands meeting certain criteria (col. 11, lines 10-35), and an act of

notifying the one or more identified client applications that a high-level document

command meeting the certain criteria has been received prior to implementing the

high-level document command (col. 15, lines 15-45).

Bernstein does not explicitly disclose wherein the high-level document command

includes one or more operations to be performed on a document comprising one of an

email document and a folder having an email document. However, Kikinis discloses

that email documents and folders containing email documents can be operated upon via

a hypermedia system (Kikinis, page 2, lines 17-27). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bernstein to

perform operations on email documents and folders containing email documents. The

motivation for doing so would be to provide a standard mechanism to access email that

supports multiple clients (page 1, lines 17-31).

Referring to Claim 25:

Bernstein discloses a database management system for implementing high level

document commands for performing an operation on a document, each document being

associated with a plurality of tables in an underlying database, the database

management system comprising (col. 8, lines 50-65):

a database application that is configured to send high-level document commands

(col. 11, lines 10-25);

a notification component that is configured to send a notification to any identified

client application when only given high-level document commands meeting certain

criteria are received by the database management system (col. 15, lines15-30), and

prior to implementation of any of the high level document commands (col. 15, lines 15-

25);

an instruction receiver module that is configured to receive instructions from the

notified third party application on how to implement the high-level document commands

(col. 15, lines 25-45); and

a database engine configured to follow the received instructions when

implementing the high-level document commands (col. 15, lines 30-42).

Bernstein does not explicitly disclose wherein the high-level document

commands comprise one or more operations to be performed on one of an email

document and a folder having an email document. However, Kikinis discloses that

email documents and folders containing email documents can be operated upon via a

hypermedia system (Kikinis, page 2, lines 17-27). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bernstein to

perform operations on email documents and folders containing email documents. The

motivation for doing so would be to provide a standard mechanism to access email that

supports multiple clients (page 1, lines 17-31).

Referring to Claims 2 and 20:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claims 1 and 19

above. Bernstein further discloses, wherein the received instructions are for performing

additional high-level document commands in addition to the received high-level

document command [the context menus containing multiple commands] (col. 15, line

30-50; illustrated by Figures 11-15).

Referring to Claims 3 and 21:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claims 2 and 20

above. Bernstein further discloses, wherein the additional high-level document

commands and the received high-level document command are implemented atomically

in the database (by keeping all the information separate, as suggested by col. 8, lines

60-65).

Referring to Claim 4:

Bernstein, Kikinis, and Elmasri disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 3

above. Bernstein further suggests, wherein the additional high-level document

command and the received high-level document command are implemented atomically

using a group operation, as evidenced by Figure 24, in which an "Apply" button is

presented that makes all needed changes to the various tabs (Text, Abstract, Styles,

and Position) as a group operation.

Referring to Claim 5:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above.

Bernstein further discloses, wherein the received instructions are for changing how the

high-level document command is to be implemented in a database that is accessed by

the database management system (col. 15, lines 30-50).

Referring to Claim 6:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above.

Bernstein further discloses, wherein the received instructions are for preventing the

high-level document command from being implemented at all (col. 15, lines 30-50).

Referring to Claim 7:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above.

Kikinis further discloses wherein the high level document command is for performing an

operation on an electronic mail message (page 3, lines 21-27).

Referring to Claim 8:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above.

Kikinis further discloses wherein the high level document command is for performing an

operation on a folder that contains electronic mail messages (page 3, lines 21-27).

Referring to Claim 9:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above.

Bernstein further discloses, wherein the high-level document command is for moving

the document [marker] (col. 12, lines 35-40).

Referring to Claim 10:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above.

Bernstein further discloses, wherein the high-level document command is for deleting

the document [marker] (col. 12, lines 35-40).

Referring to Claim 11:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above.

Bernstein further discloses, wherein the high-level document command is for copying

the document (col. 14, lines 1-20).

Referring to Claim 12:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above.

Bernstein further discloses, wherein the high-level document command is for updating

the document (col. 14, lines 1-20).

Referring to Claim 13:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above.

Bernstein further discloses, wherein the high-level document command is for adding the

document [marker] (col. 14, lines 1-20).

Referring to Claims 14 and 22:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claims 1 and 19

above. Kikinis further discloses, wherein the act of notifying the one or more identified

client applications comprises an act of transmitting a message to a machine that hosts

the client application, the machine that host the client application being different than

the machine that hosts the database management system (page 4, line 25 – page 5,

line 2).

Referring to Claims 15 and 23:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claims 1 and 19 above. Bernstein further discloses, wherein the act of notifying the one or more identified client applications comprises an act of passing the notification through a function call to the identified client application, the client application hosted by the same machine as at least the portion of the database management system responsible for performing the act of notifying the client applications (col. 15, lines 20-35).

Referring to Claim 16:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. Bernstein further discloses, wherein the act of receiving instructions from the one or more client applications occurs prior to the act of receiving the high-level document command (col. 15, lines 20-45).

Referring to Claim 18:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 17 above. Bernstein further discloses, wherein the step for allowing one or more client applications to affect how the received high level document command is to be implemented further includes:

an act of receiving instructions from the one or more client applications on how to affect the implementation of the high-level document command in the database; and an act of altering one or more operations included in the single high-level document

command according to the   received instructions when implementing the high-level

document command (col. 15, lines 20-50).

Referring to Claim 24:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 17 above.

Bernstein further discloses, wherein the computer-readable media comprises one or

more physical storage media (Fig. 2).

Referring to Claim 28:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 7 above.

Kikinis further discloses a command to change text in the electronic mail message [by

inserting addresses into an existing email] (page 4, lines 7-10).

7.   Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bernstein and Kikinis as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Chupin et al.

(U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2003/0222902, claiming priority to Provisional Application

60/137269).

Referring to claim 27:

Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 7 above.

Neither reference explicitly teaches a command to prevent the electronic mail message

from being stored when the electronic mail message contains certain offensive words.

However, Chupin discloses this limitation (PGPub: paragraphs 23 and 32; Provisional:

page 13, lines 10-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to include a command to filter electronic mail when

said electronic mail contains certain offensive words, with the motivation being to

improve the user experience, particularly when the user is a young child (PGPub:

paragraphs 0005 and 0006; Provisional: pages 2-3).

8.   Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bernstein and Kikinis as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of RFC 1730

("Internet Message Access Protocol – Version 4").

Referring to claim 29:

        Bernstein and Kikinis disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 7 above.

Neither reference explicitly teaches a command to copy the electronic mail message to

at least one in-box other than an in-box of an intended recipient of the electronic mail

message upon determining that the electronic mail message is marked as urgent.

However, RFC 1730 teaches that it is possible to copy electronic mail messages to

other in-boxes (page 35, section 6.4.8: COPY command) on messages that can be

marked as urgent (page 50: FLAGS). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a command to copy

email into the combination of Bernstein and Kikinis, with the motivation being to allow

for means to manipulate remote mailboxes in a functionally identical way to the means

for manipulating local mailboxes (page 1, Abstract).

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tom Gyorfi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3849.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AU 2135

TAG
3/14/05